UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,306	07/30/2003	Robert Thomas Cato	RPS920030029US1	9068

47052 7590 11/01/2005

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
PO BOX 51418
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER	
SHERMAN, STEPHEN G	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2674	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/630,306	CATO, ROBERT THOMAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen G. Sherman	2674	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 July 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/30/03
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for failing to properly define the term m. For examination purposes the examiner will assume that m is an integer value.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for failing to properly define the term k. For examination purposes the examiner will assume that k is an integer value.

4. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because it is unclear what a second plurality of presentations is in reference to since there is no mention of a first plurality of presentations. For examination purposes the examiner assumes that the second plurality of presentations is a first plurality of presentations and that the mentioned third plurality of presentations should be the second plurality of presentations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 9-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Branson (US 6,819,304).

Regarding claim 1, Branson discloses an autonomic composite display, comprising: an n number of display positions in the autonomic composite display where n is at least equal to two (Figures 4A-4C. From the figures it can be seen that there are a number of display positions.); an m number of display devices for engaging the n number of display positions (Figures 4A-4C. From the figures it can be seen that there are a number of display devices that connect together.); and a composite display controller for presenting an 1 number of presentations on the m number of display devices wherein the controller automatically detects a change to m and modifies the 1 number of presentations responsive to the change (Column 5, lines 44-61. The examiner interprets that if the device is configured to automatically detect a modification that it would contain a controller.).

Regarding claim 9, Branson discloses a method of autonomically adjusting presentations on each of a plurality of electronic display devices making up a composite sign in response to a change in the number of electronic display devices used in the sign under control of a computer system, comprising the steps of: (a) monitoring for a change in m by the computing system, where m was the number of active devices in the composite sign before the change and m' is the number of active devices in the composite sign after the change (Column 5, lines 44-61. The examiner interprets that the device configured to automatically detect a modification would consist of monitoring for a change.); and (b) adjusting, by the computer system, one or more presentations exhibited on the m' devices in response to the change (Column 5, lines 44-61).

Regarding claim 10, Branson discloses the method of claim 9 wherein the adjusting step b) uses arrangement parameter values assigned to each presentation (Column 5, lines 44-61. The examiner interprets that the displayed image that is adjusted is a presentation that would have an arrangement value such that the image is displayed correctly, i.e. since there are multiple screens, there would be an order parameter for the displays such that the picture isn't displayed backwards, upside-down, etc.).

Regarding claim 12, Branson discloses the method of claim 10 wherein the arrangement parameter values include order values (Column 5, lines 44-61. The examiner interprets that the displayed image that is adjusted is a presentation that would have an arrangement value such that the image is displayed correctly, i.e. since

there are multiple screens, there would be an order parameter for the displays such that the picture isn't displayed backwards, upside-down, etc.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branson (US 6,819,304) in view of Santoro et al. (US 2003/0020671).

Regarding claim 2, Branson discloses the autonomic composite display of claim 1. Branson fails to teach of an autonomic composite display wherein an 1 number of presentations are selected from a set of individual presentations and wherein the

controller presents a k number of instances of one or more individual presentations. Santoro et al. disclose of a display in which an 1 number of presentations are selected from a set of individual presentations and wherein a user presents a number of instances of one or more individual presentations (Paragraphs [0088] and [0089]. The examiner interprets that since the tiles can present information content from a plurality of sources that this information would be individual presentations and that the user would select from different web pages or applications to select what is presented in each of the tiles and that if the user so desired that they could choose to have two of the tiles present the same information/presentation.). Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art to combine the user selection system of Santoro et al. and incorporate this multiple presentation format into the controller and display of Branson such that the controller could control multiple presentations instead of just a single image in order to allow for the automatic adjustment to these multiple presentations in a similar fashion as that of the singular image/presentation in conjunction with the addition or removal of display sections.

Regarding claim 3, Branson and Santoro et al. disclose the autonomic composite display of claim 2. Santoro et al. also discloses wherein a user reduces k for a particular presentation Px by 1 when there are more presentations to be displayed than there are tiles (Paragraphs [0088] and [0089]. The examiner interprets that since the user can define which presentations are in which tile, that if the user had two tiles displaying the same information and wanted to display new information not displayed on any of the tiles that the user would inherently put the new information on one of the tiles

which had a duplicate presentation and that this methodology when combined with the teaching of Branson would apply to when the number of displays are reduced, which applies to there being more presentations than display tiles.).

Regarding claim 4, Branson and Santoro et al. disclose the autonomic composite display of claim 2. Santoro et al. also discloses wherein a user increases k for a particular presentation Px by 1 when there are more display tiles than there are presentations (Paragraphs [0088] and [0089]. The examiner interprets that since the user can define which presentations are in which tile, that if the user only wanted to display 5 different sets of information/presentations and there are 6 tiles available, that it would be obvious for the user to display one of the presentations twice instead of having the extra tile blank/empty. When this methodology is combined with the teaching of Branson it would be obvious that if there were only 5 presentations to display and a display section was added, that instead of having the display section not display anything that it would display a duplicate of one of the other presentations.).

Regarding claim 5, Branson discloses the autonomic composite display of claim 1. Branson also discloses wherein m is reduced by 1 by removing an mth display (Figures 5C-5D) and a controller substituting a composite presentation on a selected one of the m-1 display devices when detecting the change to m, with the composite presentation including elements from a presentation previously presented on the mth display device and from a presentation previously presented on the selected display device at the time that the change was detected (Figures 5C-5D. In the figures it can be seen that when the number of displays is reduced that the information displayed on the

single screen is a combination of the information of the first and second screens.). Branson fails to teach of a autonomic composite display wherein the 1 number of presentations are selected from a set of individual presentations, wherein the controller presents a k number of instances of one or more individual presentations on the m number of display devices and wherein m is reduced by 1 by removing an mth display device from the autonomic composite display. Santoro et al. disclose wherein a user presents a k number of instances of one or more individual presentations on a number of display tiles (Paragraphs [0088] and [0089]. The examiner interprets that since the tiles can present information content from a plurality of sources that this information would be individual presentations and that the user would select from different web pages or applications to select what is presented in each of the tiles and that if the user so desired that they could choose to have two of the tiles present the same information/presentation.). Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art to combine the user selection system of Santoro et al. and incorporate this multiple presentation format into the controller and display of Branson such that the controller could control multiple presentations instead of just a single image in order to allow for the automatic adjustment to these multiple presentations in a similar fashion as that of the singular image/presentation in conjunction with the addition or removal of display sections.

Regarding claim 6, Branson and Santoro et al. disclose the autonomic composite display of claim 2. Santoro et al. also disclose wherein the individual presentations each have an associated priority and wherein the user has only a limited number of

presentation spaces available for a number of presentations and replaces one of the displayed presentations having a lower priority than the particular presentation (Paragraph [0088] and [0089]. The examiner interprets that since the user can select a presentation for each of the tiles, that if there were 7 sets of information that the user wanted to display but only 6 display tiles that the user would select the least important of the 7 presentations and choose not to display that information. When used in conjunction with the display described by Branson, it makes sense that if multiple presentations were displayed instead of one that when the number of display sections is reduced, that the least important of these presentations would be taken off of the display.).

Regarding claim 7, Branson and Santoro et al. disclose the autonomic composite display of claim 6. Santoro et al. also disclose wherein the user first substitutes displayed presentations having k greater than 1 (Paragraphs [0088] and [0089]. The examiner interprets that since the user can define which presentations are in which tile, that if the user had two tiles displaying the same information and wanted to display new information not displayed on any of the tiles that the user would inherently put the new information on one of the tiles which had a duplicate presentation before removing the presentation which was least important and that this methodology when combined with the teaching of Branson would apply to when the number of displays are reduced, which applies to there being more presentations than display tiles.).

Regarding claim 8, Branson and Santoro et al. disclose the autonomic composite display of claim 2. Santoro et al. also disclose wherein the individual presentations

each have an associated priority and wherein the user substitutes a particular presentation for a displayed presentation on one of the display tiles when the displayed presentation has a priority equal to the particular presentation and the displayed presentation has k greater than 1 (Paragraph [0088] and [0089]. The examiner interprets that since there are 6 display tiles that the user could have two of the tiles displaying the same information, and that if the user desired another presentation to be displayed that was of equal importance to them as another presentation displayed twice that the user would select to have the new presentation take the place of one of the repeated presentations. When combined with the display of Branson, this methodology could be applied to when the display size is reduce by the removal of a display section.).

Regarding claim 11, Branson discloses the method of claim 10. Branson fails to teach a method wherein the arrangement parameter values include priority values. Santoro et al. disclose a method wherein an arrangement parameter value includes priority values (Paragraphs [0088] and [0089]. The examiner interprets that the user selects what to display on each of the display tiles based on hat is most important therefore giving the information a priority.). Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art to associate the arrangement parameter of Branson with a priority value as taught by Santoro et al. in order to allow for the automatic adjustment of a display device wherein instead of reducing the size of one image when a display section is removed, an adjustment would be made to multiple presentations displayed and that the most important information would continue to be displayed.

Regarding claim 13, Branson discloses the method of claim 10. Branson fails to teach a method wherein the arrangement parameter values include duplicate presentation number values. Santoro et al. disclose a method wherein an arrangement parameter value includes duplicate presentation number values (Paragraphs [0088] and [0089]. The examiner interprets that the user could have the same information/presentation displayed on two of the display tiles and that arrangement of the other tiles, such as if a presentation was to be added, would be based on this duplication.). Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art to associate the arrangement parameter of Branson with duplicate presentations as taught by Santoro et al. in order to allow for the replacement of information displayed twice with information not being displayed at all when the number of display sections is reduced.

Regarding claim 14, Branson discloses an autonomic composite display, comprising: means for arranging a first plurality of devices into the composite display (The examiner understands that it is inherent to have a plurality of devices, such as CRTs or LCDs arranged into a composite display.) and means for discretely and independently exhibiting a presentation and means for controlling a presentation on the devices including automatic detection of a change to the presentation and modification of the presentation in response to the change (Column 5, lines 44-61. The examiner interprets that since the device automatically detects a modification that there would be a controller that would perform this function.). Branson fails to teach of having an autonomic composite display in which the plurality of devices exhibit a plurality of presentations. Santoro et al. disclose of a display in which a plurality of tiles exhibit a

plurality of presentations (Paragraph [0088] and [0089]. The examiner interprets that the second plurality of presentations and third plurality of presentations would be represented by the fact that the user can select whatever is displayed on the tile and that the second plurality would refer to one configuration and the third plurality would refer to a second configuration.). Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art to combine the display taught by Branson to include the adjustment of the display when individual presentations are displayed on the display sections as taught by Santoro et al. in order to allow for the automatic adjustment of the presentations being displayed without the need for the user to make the change themselves such as is the displays were used in a situation that would not allow someone to fix the display right away if there were a malfunction.

Regarding claim 15, Branson discloses a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for autonomically adjusting an exhibited presentation on a composite sign, the computer readable program code means in the computer usable medium comprising: computer readable program code means for arranging a presentation into a plurality of devices of the composite display; computer readable program code means for discretely and independently exhibiting a presentation; and computer readable programs code means for controlling the presentation on the exhibiting means including automatic detection of a change to the presentation and modifies the presentation responsive to the change (Column 5, lines 44-61. The examiner interprets that since the display is configured, that this configuration would be in a computer usable medium and that it would contain computer

readable program code to accomplish the functions.). Branson fails to teach of a computer usable medium having computer readable program code for exhibiting a first, second and third plurality of presentations. Santoro et al. disclose of a exhibiting a first, second and third plurality of presentations (Paragraphs [0088] and [0089]. The examiner interprets that since the user can choose what is displayed on the display tiles that there would be a plurality of presentations presented and that by changing what is presented in one of the tiles that this would constitute as different pluralities of presentations.). Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art to combine the display taught by Branson to include multiple presentation information for a plurality of presentations as taught by Santoro et al. so that instead of having the program update the display to change the size of the presentation displayed when display sections are removed or added, that the program could update the plurality of presentations displayed such that multiple information could be displayed when the display sections are changed

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen G. Sherman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2941. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SS

20 October 2005

REGINA LIANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER